

WOODCOTE PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES of the Parish Council meeting held in the Function Room, Village Hall, Woodcote
Wednesday 7th February 2018 at 7.30pm.

PRESENT

Chairman	
Vice Chair	Dr. G. Botting. Chaired the Meeting
	Mr. A. Crockett
	Mr. M. Smith
	Mr. B. Williams
	Mr. D. Booth
	Mrs. D. Hadaway
	Dr. P. Sudbury
Parish Clerk	Ms. Jenny Welham

1. To receive apologies for absence.
Mr. R. Peirce.

2. To receive Declarations of Interest
Cllr. Crockett in planning application P18/S0004/O.

3. **Public Forum**: Opportunity for members of the public to address the Council, the public may also speak about specific items of business as they arise, with the permission of the Chairman.
None present.

4. To approve Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on 17th January 2017.
Approved as a true record.

5. Matters arising from those Minutes not on the agenda elsewhere.
Cllr. Crockett requested that the matter of new closed top bins on the Reading Road be brought to the next PC meeting and the quotation be reviewed.

6. Planning Applications

P18/S0004/O (Outline) : Major Proposal: Outline planning application for the erection of up to 45 homes, access, parking, landscaping, open space, play area and associated infrastructure, including removal of existing paddock structures. All matters reserved except for means of access. Address: Land south of Bridle Path Woodcote.

Cllr Smith had reviewed the application and gave a summary of the issues. The Full detailed response from the Parish Council can be seen Appendix One (1) of these minutes. The Parish Council voted unanimously to recommend refusal.

6.1 Applications Granted by SODC:

P17/S4211/HH Application proposal, including any amendments : Proposed first floor extension. Site Location : Horns Farm Tidmore Lane Woodcote RG8 0PH.

P17/S4153/FUL Application proposal, including any amendments :

Existing small Pool House be replaced with a larger structure with the same alignment, similar in appearance, but enlarged to provide a more useful structure. The replacement building is to set centrally on axis with the pool (as existing). A gymnasium/Studio Room, with associated WC and Changing Room, has been added to the rear. Site Location : Langtree House Red Lane Woodcote RG8 0PA.

P17/S2878/FUL Application proposal, including any amendments :
Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) to convert approved garage into a playroom and provide additional parking on the frontage of Plot 2 and 3 of Planning Permission P16/S2432/FUL. (Amended 2017_10_25 to reduce number of bedrooms in both plot 2 and plot 3 and by plans 2017_12_05 to increasing number of parking spaces). Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of two 3-bedroom semi detached houses and a detached 2-bedroom chalet bungalow. Site Location : Casa Mia Greenmore Woodcote RG8 0RN.

6.2 Applications Refused by SODC

6.3 Other Planning Matters

None.

7. Finance

Payment Listing 30 Jan to 7th Feb Woodcotevillage Council

Date Paid	Payee Name	Ref	Amount	Transaction Detail
30/01/2018	British Telecom	DD	£79.26	Monthly line & BB NHP Team Mtg
05/02/2018	WVHMC	TRANSFER	£34.00	22/2
05/02/2018	WVHMC	TRANSFER	£85.50	NHP Consultation 23/2
08-Feb	J. Welham	Transfer	£105.60	Back pay
Total			£304.36	

Payments Approved

Receipts noted:

CCLA Dividend payment from Porperty Fund £1219.

CCLA Interest from Deposit Account £24.50.

7.1 Quotations/Grants received for review/approval.

Quotation from for various capital works to the Village Hall, covering roofing, damp course, new kitchen water heater.

Premier Heating new water heater for kitchen £347.00

Bondright Roofing repair/ replace downpipe, replace plaster board, wire cages over water outlets on roof of VH £1350.00

Bondright Roofing replace 50 broken and cracked tiles to tiled roof area VH £465.00

Peter Cox following inspection and report for rising damp to function room area in VH injection of walls to prevent damp £1969.00

The PC approved these quotations although this will take the VH Capital budget to overspend it can be offset by next FY year's budget from 1st April 2018.

The Clerk reminded the PC of the quote before Christmas for the overhanging tree to a garden in Long Toll. The resident had chased this again. The quote was approximately £270.00.

The PC agreed that the work should be carried out.

8. Parish Clerk Salary – Review and back pay.

The Chairman explained that the new salary scales had been received sometime after they were effective. The Clerk's annual review had taken place early February and it was agreed to implement the latest review and back date it to April 2017.

Total amount of back pay being £105.60. The Clerk remains on spinal point 32 at the new level. A further review will take place in September so any increase in the Clerk's spinal point can be discussed in advance of budget setting for the next financial year.

9. Communication Strategy – review after 3 month trial

Cllr. Sudbury and Cllr. Smith had some minor alterations that they recommended to the guidelines, Cllr. McGurk to make these changes. The PC agreed to adopt the guidelines following the changes being made and the document to be circulated.

10. Other Village Committees & Groups Reports

Village Hall Committee – The income is down 2% on last year and the costs are increased by 6%. The Halls income has been falling steadily over the past several years. Further marketing is being attempted. The VH will make a trading loss of £4.6K.

Village Green – A working group had taken place earlier in the week and more bark chippings had been laid to the access areas onto the green to prevent the mud. A hard surfaced path was raised again and it was suggested that this project be looked at in more detail in the future.

Traffic Advisory Group

The Clerk continues to chase OCC for the costing for the Zebra Crossing. The PC agreed tht higher escalation is now needed. Clerk to raise this with OCC.

Neighbourhood Plan Advisory Group – Preparations for the public consultation are under way and progressing well.

11. Other Matters for Chairman

Cllr. Crockett advised that he is running the Great British Spring clean weekend for Woodcote with his wife. It will take place over the weekend of 3RD/4TH March, most volunteers offering to help on the Sunday.

He also advised that the speed sign on the Oxford Road into the village is not working, the Clerk is aware of this and needs to action a repair. The pole is cracked and it has listed over into the hedge.

The Chairman advised that he had been asked about some old documents relating to the Village Appraisal in by gone years, and if there was value in archiving these documents. The PC agreed that due their age they would be of little value now.

12. Correspondence

None.

13. To note date of the next Parish Council Meeting: Wednesday 21st February 2018.

Meeting closed at 9.00pm

Signed Date.....

APPENDIX ONE (1). Woodcote Parish Council Meeting Minutes 7th February 2018.

Woodcote Parish Council considers that this application should be REFUSED because the proposed development:

- I. Encroaches upon the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty;
- II. Fails to comply with policies in the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy;
- III. Fails to comply with policies in the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan; and
- IV. Has a significant negative impact on traffic on Bridle Path and the junction between Bridle Path and Goring Road.

These are expanded upon in the succeeding sections.

1. Context

Planning applications in Woodcote must be considered against:

- the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan (WNP);
- the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy (CS); and
- the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The NPPF requires Local Planning Authorities (LPA) to maintain a five year land supply. NPPF paragraph 49 says that decision makers should not consider the housing policies within the local plan (which the Neighbourhood Plan forms part of) to be up to date if a five year land supply has not been identified. In these situations, paragraph 14 of the NPPF states that permission for development should be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, or unless specific policies, for example relating to sites designated as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs), indicate development should be restricted.

Planning Practice Guidance (11 February 2016) advises that such adverse effects not only include policy on specific types of development contained within the NPPF but also paragraphs 183-185 and paragraph 198 which state where a development conflicts with a Neighbourhood Plan that has been brought into force planning permission should be refused.

This application of the NPPF is supported by several recent appeal decisions for development within Woodcote and other villages:

- a. Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/A/14/2223330
Land at 'Goats Gambol', off Beech Lane, Woodcote, Oxfordshire RG8 0PY
In refusing the appeal the inspector said (paragraph 54)
'I have given full consideration to the NPPF's aim of encouraging sustainable development. But given the harm that I have identified, and especially the harm to the AONB, it seems to me that the development now proposed cannot properly be considered as sustainable. And in any event, the presumption in favour of such development, as set out in NPPF paragraph 14, does not apply in AONBs.'
17 June 2015
- b. Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/16/3147625
Land north of Beech Lane, Woodcote, Reading RG8 0PX
In refusing the appeal the inspector said (paragraphs 6 and 22):
'The appeal site lies within the Chilterns AONB, and consequently the presumption set out in Paragraph 14 of the Framework applies only after consideration of the effects on the AONB, and where the balance weighs in the scheme's favour.'

In this context, Paragraph 115 of the Framework requires great weight to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, and Policy CSEN1 of the Core Strategy also gives high priority to the conservation and enhancement of the AONB and states that planning decisions will have regard to its setting'

'I appreciate that the development would provide five additional dwellings in an area which does not have a five year housing land supply, as well as some associated economic and social benefits. However, this limited benefit would not outweigh the harm to the AONB identified above.'

11 October 2016

- c. Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/W/16/3146109
Land at Manor Road, Goring-on-Thames, Oxfordshire

In refusing the appeal the inspector said:

'I have concluded that the proposals would harm the character and appearance of the area, the village setting of Goring and hence the Chilterns AONB. Consequently the proposal conflicts with policies in the Framework that indicate development should be restricted. The proposals do not meet the requirements of sustainable development and are not afforded the presumption in favour of sustainable development in paragraph 14 of the Framework. The material harm that arises also conflicts with policies in the development plan and whilst I have reduced the weight I give to these, as they are policies that affect the supply of housing in the absence of a demonstrable five year housing land supply, I still afford them significant weight as they are consistent with the restraint policies in the Framework with regard to the AONB. The conflict with the Framework is a significant material consideration as is the effect on the AONB; and to this I add the general harm to the character of the area. The proposal is in conflict with the development plan in this regard and the material considerations add to this conclusion, the scheme is therefore unacceptable. I have afforded positive weight to the additional housing that would be provided and noted the level of shortfall in the five year housing land supply, as well as the affordable housing that would be secured through the planning obligation but none of these are of such weight as to outweigh the harm that I have identified.'

9 August 2016

- d. Appeal Ref:
APP/V3120/W/16/3153209

Land to the north of Lower Road, Chilton, Oxfordshire, OX11 0RR

In refusing the appeal the inspector said:

'The appellants have satisfactorily addressed 3 of the Council's 4 original reasons for refusal. However, of much greater significance is my view that the proposal fails to comply with the provisions of either the existing or the emerging development plan, taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which have been drawn to my attention which would warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. Furthermore, the proposal does not comply with the Framework's policy approach to major development in an AONB. The harm which I have identified to the setting of the village, and to the AONB landscape in which it lies, is of significant weight. My overall conclusion is that the appeal must fail.'

8 September 2016

These appeal decisions all support the view that the potential harm to the AONB significantly outweighs any benefits from the developments.

A previous application for 65 homes on this site (P16/S3306/O) was refused by SODC for the following reason:

'The application site lies beyond the edge of the settlement of Woodcote and is not a site allocated for housing within the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan. The principle of the development is therefore unacceptable. Furthermore, the proposal would constitute a major development within the Chilterns Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and there are no exceptional circumstances that are in the public interest that would justify this major development within the AONB. The proposal would cause material harm to the character and intrinsic quality of this part of the AONB and the harm would outweigh the benefits of the development. As such, the development would be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, policies CS1, CSS1, CSR1, CSEN1 and CSQ3 of the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, policies G2, G4, C4 and D1 of the South Oxfordshire Local Plan 2011 and policies H1, H10 and D1 of the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan.'

1.1 Relevance of the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan

In a Written Ministerial Statement (12 December 2016), supported by amended Planning Policy Guidance on Neighbourhood Planning (10 August 2017), the Minister stated that:

'Relevant policies for the supply of housing in a neighbourhood plan that is part of the development plan should not be deemed to be "out-of-date" under paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework where all of the following circumstances arise at the time the decision is made:

- This written ministerial statement is less than 2 years old, or the neighbourhood plan has been part of the development plan for 2 years or less;*
- the neighbourhood plan allocates sites for housing; and*
- the local planning authority can demonstrate a three-year supply of deliverable housing sites.'*

The Planning Statement, supplied as part of the application, refers to a legal challenge to this Written Ministerial Statement. On 12th January 2018, Mr Justice Dove dismissed the legal challenge, stating that:

'For all of the reasons which I have set out above I have reached the conclusion that the claimants' case on all five Grounds as advanced cannot be sustained. It follows that this claim must be dismissed.'

The Planning Statement also refers to the Thames Farm appeal decision (Ref APP/Q3115/W/16/3161733 - 2nd August 2017) where the Inspector judged that SODC had only a 2.99 year housing land supply and, therefore, the Henley and Harpsden Joint Neighbourhood Plan was deemed to be out of date.

In two subsequent appeals (Ref: APP/Q3115/W/17/3179647 - The Barn House, 46 Lower Icknield Way, Chinnor, Oxfordshire OX39 4EB – 13th December 2017 - and Ref: APP/Q3115/W/17/3169755 - Land off Fieldside Track, Long Wittenham OX14 4PZ – 3rd January 2018), the Inspector accepted that SODC had a 4.1 year housing land supply.

In both cases the neighbourhood plans were still deemed to be out of date because they did not allocate sites for housing.

The Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan does allocate sites for housing and, therefore, with a 4.1 year housing land supply does meet the conditions set out in the WMS and PPG and must be deemed to be up to date and relevant to the consideration of this application.

The weight to be given to a Neighbourhood Plan where there is a lack of a five year housing land supply is also supported by two further decisions:

- a. In the high court case of *Crane v. Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2015] EWHC 425 (Admin)* there was an unsuccessful challenge to a decision by the Secretary of State to dismiss an appeal for housing based on conflict with a Neighbourhood Plan. There was no five-year housing land supply, and so the housing policies in the plan were out of date. The main implications are:
 - A proposal on an unallocated site can be in conflict with a Neighbourhood Plan which allocates land for housing, even if it does not contain explicit policies to restrict housing elsewhere, such as a settlement boundary.
 - Conflict with a plan that is out of date can be given very substantial negative weight in the planning balance. Neither the NPPF nor case law prescribe the weight that attaches to such a plan - it is a matter of planning judgment.
- b. The Communities Secretary Sajid Javid has blocked plans for up to 100 homes at a site in Herefordshire after concluding that the development would be contrary to an emerging Neighbourhood Plan, despite the local authority being unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply.

The appeal, made by Gladman Developments, was against the decision of Herefordshire Council to refuse its application for the homes at a site at Bartestree outside Hereford.

A decision letter sent week ending 29 Oct 2016 on behalf of the Communities Secretary said that there was agreement between the parties that the council is currently only able to demonstrate a housing land supply of 3.63 years. As such, the letter said, in accordance with measures in the National Planning Policy Framework, the council's relevant policies for the supply of housing could not be considered up-to-date. The letter said that the emerging Bartestree with Lugwardine Neighbourhood Development Plan (BLNDP) contained settlement boundaries for Bartestree which excluded the appeal site.

The inspector had given the emerging plan moderate weight, but the letter said that since the inspector's report, the plan had been recommended to proceed to referendum and as the BLNDP is now at an advanced stage, the Secretary of State "attributes significant weight to the plan".

The Secretary of State attached "significant weight to the economic benefits of the scheme and to the social benefit in terms of providing much needed market and affordable housing" but, the letter said, also gave "significant weight" to the adverse impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and further significant weight to the proposal's "failure to protect or enhance ... valued landscape".

The letter added that Javid gave significant weight "to the inappropriate level of growth the scale of the proposed development would impose on this settlement and would fail to support the settlement's health and well-being". Overall, Javid concluded that the proposal "is not compliant with the development plan as a whole and cannot be considered sustainable development".

The reasons given by the Secretary of State in supporting the Council's refusal of planning permission apply to this application in Woodcote. The application conflicts with the made Neighbourhood Plan, is of a scale that will have a considerable adverse effect on the character of the area and if approved will be a failure to protect the valued landscape of the AONB .

The Planning Statement, supplied as part of the application, refers to the emerging Local Plan from SODC and the contingency policy for larger villages which states that "If a Neighbourhood Plan does not adequately progress with allocating sites (and has therefore at least been submitted to the Council) within 12 months of adoption of this Local Plan, planning applications for housing in the larger villages will be supported provide that: i. Proposals comply with the overall housing distribution strategy and ii. Proposals comply with the housing and other applicable policies in this plan." The Local Plan is not yet completed nor adopted so this contingency plan is not yet in force.

Woodcote is at an advanced stage in updating its Neighbourhood Plan and intends to submit the revised plan, which will cover all land use in the village, soon after the Local Plan is adopted and certainly within the 12 month period. Woodcote also has an excellent record of delivering the houses in the plan.

As such the emerging Local Plan and its contingency for lack of progress with Neighbourhood Plans is not a relevant consideration in assessing this application.

2. Impact on AONB

The site lies within the Chilterns AONB. As such paragraph 115 of the NPPF applies. **This requires great weight to be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs (as does policy CSEN1 of the CS).**

The site is situated behind the existing developed frontage and cannot be considered as infill within the terms set out in the CS and WNP. Furthermore, the site is not allocated for development in the WNP, and the proposal is not in any way related to agricultural or other special needs.

Consequently, the proposed development would not come within any of the categories allowed by Core Strategy Policy CSR1 or WNP Policy H10.

The Inspector in the appeal decision on the Goat's Gambol site (Appeal Ref: APP/Q3115/A/14/2223330) made the following comments about the effect of the development on the area's character and appearance (paragraphs 24-26):

'The landscape of the Chiltern escarpment in South Oxfordshire is described in the Character Assessment report (South Oxfordshire Landscape Character Assessment, 2003) as the most visually distinctive in the district, with gentle slopes and a mosaic of woodland, scrub and open grassland, which give it an intimate, enclosed character.'

The appeal site comprises an enclosed area of grass paddocks, bounded by woodland and a tree belt, and thus exhibits several of these characteristics.

As such, it seems to me that the site represents a good example of the type of landscape that the AONB designation, and CS Policy CSEN1, are intended to recognise and protect.

The effect of the development would be to change the site from its present mainly undeveloped state, into a fully developed housing site with roads and buildings. This would mean the loss of those characteristics which best reflect the local landscape's prevailing character and distinctiveness. The effect would thus be damaging to the AONB, and to the character and appearance of the area generally.

It is true that the site is not particularly prominent. However, the proposed development would be clearly seen from the site entrance in Beech Lane, especially since, as was established at the site visit, the existing hedge alongside the access would have to be removed, and could not be replaced on land within the appellants' control. The development would also be visible from the attractive public footpath that runs just to the east, from Wood Lane to Lambourne's Wood. Both of these are public views of some significance. I agree that in these views, the site appears as a discrete, self-contained landscape compartment, rather than as part of a wider open landscape. But in this respect the site is typical of this part of the AONB. This reinforces my view that the impact on the AONB would be harmful.'

The Bridle Path application clearly constitutes backland development. If allowed, the effect would be to change the site from its present undeveloped state into a fully developed housing site with roads and buildings. This would mean the loss of those characteristics which best reflect the local landscape's prevailing character and distinctiveness. The site is clearly visible from the public footpath (411/9) that runs from Bridle Path to Potkiln Lane, a public view of some significance, and its development would damage both the AONB, and the character and appearance of the area generally.

The proposed development would not conserve or enhance the area's natural beauty, but would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the local landscape and on the setting of the village of Woodcote. A substantial development of 45 homes outside the built-up area of the village cannot be justified when set against the conflicts with the relevant policies for housing in villages and in the countryside, the loss of countryside in the AONB, the harm to the area's character and appearance, the requirement of NPPF paragraph 115 that in AONBs conservation of the landscape should be given great weight, and when the WNP is being revised to comply with the emerging Local Plan,

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF states that. "Planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas (AONBs) except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. Consideration of such applications should include an assessment of:

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated."

There is no formal definition within the NPPF or Planning Guidance for what constitutes “major” development but case law and expert opinion indicate that the common definition of the word major should be used by planning authorities in determining whether a development is major. In this context, recent appeal decisions have identified developments that increase the size of a village by between 4% and 12% to be major developments. This development of 45 houses would increase the size of Woodcote by over 4%.

The Planning Statement acknowledges that this development may be considered as major but asserts that it is not possible to meet the housing need elsewhere. The Planning Statement asserts that most of South Oxfordshire is in the AONB and, therefore, there are limited opportunities to develop outside the AONB. In reality, there are significant areas in the north of the District that are outside the AONB and, in the south, towns and villages that are also excluded from the AONB, such as Sonning Common and Henley. There are, therefore, ample opportunities to locate major development outside the AONB as has been identified in the emerging Local Plan 2033.

Also, the updated Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan is identifying sites with minimal impact on the AONB to meet the local housing need.

The Planning Statement also refers to the comment in the Thames Farm appeal about the lack of affordable housing over the last six years. According to the Authority Monitoring Report 2016/17, 990 affordable houses have been built in the last five years which does not agree with the assertion that there is a dire shortage of affordable housing. Indeed, within Woodcote, 10 affordable houses have been built on the first of the Neighbourhood Plan sites and planning permission has been granted for the next three sites which will deliver a further 21 affordable homes.

This development must be considered as a major development and, therefore, paragraph 116 of the NPPF applies. There is no significant impact on the local economy, there are other locations for additional housing that would better meet the need for additional housing and this development has a detrimental effect on the environment and landscape and should, therefore, be refused.

3. Impact on traffic

There are limited employment opportunities within the village so most residents will commute to other locations such as Wallingford, Henley, Reading, Oxford or London. **The Traffic Assessment seems to have been made on the assumption that many residents will travel to work (mostly in Reading) by bus and that most children will walk to school – assumptions that are not supported by experience.**

The assessment of traffic impact in the Transport Statement is based on theoretical models and, not surprisingly, results in minimal impacts on the traffic in the village. For example, they assess that there will only be 21 vehicle movements out of the site during the AM peak period from 8.00am to 9.00am and this from 45 houses many of which are family homes, predominantly 2, 3 and 4 bedroom properties with probably 2-3 cars per property so that there could be 90-135 cars on site. There are 105 bedrooms in this development, assuming 80% occupancy of the bedrooms and 60% of the residents in employment gives 50 residents in employment. Census records indicate that, in this area, 74% rely on a private motor vehicle to get to work, i.e. 37 vehicles - most of which will emerge during the peak 8.00 – 9.00am period. This does not include additional journeys conveying children to school. **So a more realistic estimate of vehicle movements is at least twice the estimate in the Transport Statement.**

The Transport Statement includes detailed measurements of traffic volumes and speeds on Bridle Path and summary data for other roads nearby. The traffic volumes measured in July 2016 are in broad agreement with results obtained by Woodcote Parish Council in 2015 although the speeds measured are lower than those measured in 2015.

Based on the data for traffic volumes at peak periods and the optimistic assessment of traffic movements into/out of the site there would be an increase of 57% in traffic movements on Bridle Path between 8.00 and 9.00 and an increase of 47% between 17.00 and 18.00. **Using the less optimistic figures calculated above would give increases of approximately 120% and 100% respectively. These increases are dismissed as insignificant in the Transport Statement.**

The Transport Statement also includes detailed assessments of the impact of the increased traffic on road junctions within the village using a theoretical model and the observed current traffic movements. The most significant junction is the junction between Bridle Path, Goring Road and Beech Lane near to the Cooperative store which was identified in the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan as a traffic hotspot. **The assessment of the impact on this junction was that it would not be significant; however, the assessment does not appear to take into account local factors such as the on-street parking, bus route, deliveries and visibility issues at this location.**

4. Failure to comply with policies in the Core Strategy

The application fails to comply with CS policies on both landscape and housing.

a) Policy CSR1 Housing in Villages

Policy CSR1 (CS) allows infill development where infill is defined as the filling of small gaps in otherwise built up frontages, or on other sites closely surrounded by buildings. **The application site does not meet this definition and, as admitted by the applicant cannot be considered as infill and therefore permissible under policy CSR1.**

b) Policy CSEN1 Landscape

Policy CSEN1 requires that the district's distinct landscape character and key features be protected against inappropriate development and where possible enhanced and states that:

"High priority will be given to conservation and enhancement of the Chilterns and North Wessex Downs Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) and planning decisions will have regard to their setting. Proposals which support the economies and social well being of the AONBs and their communities, including affordable housing schemes, will be encouraged provided they do not conflict with the aims of conservation and enhancement."

The proposed site lies entirely within the Chilterns AONB and its development will neither conserve nor enhance the AONB.

Similar policies to these are proposed in the emerging Local Plan 2033.

5. Failure to comply with policies in the Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan

The Woodcote Neighbourhood Plan received a 91% Yes vote on a 60% turnout in the referendum and was, therefore, supported by an absolute majority of the community.

The proposed site was one of 24 considered for inclusion in the WNP for development but comprehensively rejected as contrary to the community's wishes to protect open spaces and the AONB by the community in the consultations run on the 5th and 9th February 2013,

AND not meeting the site selection criteria developed from the consultations with the community, most notably the requirement for small sites with no more than 24 dwellings. **Therefore, this application does not comply with policy HS1.**

The WNP is delivering the new homes required. Since being 'made' in May 2014:

- 18% of the new homes identified have been built and are occupied; and
- planning permission has been granted for a further 70%.

Thus the evidence suggests that nearly 90% of the new homes identified for development before 2027 will have been built within the next 18-24 months.

The applicant does not claim that this site can be considered as infill and, as 'backland', **the site fails to comply with policy H10(a) and policy H10(c) of the WNP.**

The applicant acknowledges that the development is outside the settlement policy boundary but claims it is a logical extension to the village. **The application will involve significant outward extension of the built-up area of the village and therefore fails to comply with policy H10 (b) of the WNP.**

The application is for 45 houses and, therefore, fails to comply with policy H9 which requires a maximum of 24 new homes on any site.

Policy H7 requires that, on sites with 9 or more new homes, up to 10% of new homes should be 1 bedroom, at least 40% 2 bedroom, at least 40% 3 bedroom and up to 10% 4 bedroom. **This application does not comply with policy H7 as there are 24% 1 bedroom, 33% 2 bedroom, 27% 3 bedroom and 16% 4 bedroom dwellings.**

The entrance to the new development is some 180 metres from the junction of the Goring Road and Bridle Path and Beech Lane. This is a busy, highly congested junction with a Cooperative store, limited parking and a bus stop. **This proposal fails to show that it will not, as required by WNP policy T1, exacerbate traffic congestion at this dangerous crossroads.**